<div align="center">REMARKS</div>

After entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 4, 7-11, 13-18, and 25-30 are pending in the application.

Claims 29-31 are newly added, and respectively depend from independent claims 1, 4 and 11.

Claims 19-24 are newly canceled.

The withdrawal of the earlier Final Rejection is noted with appreciation. In the present paper applicant has made claim amendments and remarks seeking to expedite allowance of the application.

Claim 4 stands rejected as anticipated by Roese (20030217122). The claim is believed properly patentable over the art, and amendments have been made to the claim to help make such distinctions more apparent.

As amended, claim 4 is drawn to a method of providing entertainment content from a distributor to a home. For example a pay per view sports network may stream a soccer match to a consumer.

The content data is transmitted in packets that identify the intended destination – within the home (i.e., the first destination address). Thus, the distributor intends the content to be received by the first destination address.

The claimed arrangement concerns potential re-distribution of the content, e.g., the consumer having a device that forwards received packets from the intended recipient address (the first destination address) to another address (e.g., a friend's house).

To address such potential re-distribution, the claimed method specifies that the distributor forms the header data so as to include additional information specifying whether it is permissible to send a copy of data in the packet to a second destination address.

This additional data has one of two states. State 1 indicates it is not permissible to send a copy of the content data anywhere else (i.e., it is forbidden to send the content data to any second destination address).

<div align="center">7</div>

State 2 is more permissive. State 2 indicates it is not permissible to send a copy of the content data anywhere else _except_ to _an address within a domain that also includes the destination intended by the distributor_ (i.e., the domain that includes the first destination address – the home).

Turning to the art, it will be understood that Roese does not teach the presently-claimed arrangement.

As shown in Roese's Fig. 6, and paragraphs [0115] – [0117], his arrangement inserts a tag in certain packets. This tag indicates that the packets should not be accessed if found outside a specified location. His tag thus has only a single state. His tag only indicates a single type of restriction.

Moreover, Roese doesn't employ the concept around which the present method is structured, namely: that a distributor _intends_ delivery of a packet to a first specified address (and a redistribution restriction is then defined by reference to that address).

Rather than delivering content to an _intended destination_ like applicant, Roese concerns delivering content to an _intended user_. But this initial delivery is conditional. Even though the user is authorized, the delivery may still be denied if the user is in an unauthorized location.

Thus, Roese conditions _initial delivery_ of the content on location – a concept with which the present claim does not concern itself.   And he does not teach information that governs redistribution by reference to the original recipient address (either prohibiting all redistribution, or limiting to addresses with the domain of the original recipient address – the two states claimed).

Moreover, Roese's location restriction requires expressly defining the location restriction. Applicant's claimed arrangement can be practiced, e.g., using a single bit flag. (Same is particularly claimed in claim 30.)

In view of such distinctions, claim 4 is believed to be patentable over the cited art.

Claim 11 was also rejected as anticipated by Roese, and has also been amended to help make distinctions over Roese more apparent.

As described in paragraph [0117], a device within Roese's system (or the data itself) determines whether the next hop in data routing will take the data outside the permitted location.

This is different than the claimed arrangement. The claimed arrangement is silent about intermediate hop locations. The claim involves decision-making at the first location. This first location corresponds to the first destination address, which was specified in the packet. (Intermediate hop locations are not specified in the packet – they are determined "on-the-fly" by routers.)

While Roese has a location restriction, he does not teach governing *re-transmission* by additional data having two states, namely: (1) no re-transmission, or (2) no re-transmission except to addresses within a domain that includes the first destination address.

As discussed in connection with claim 4, Roese's location restriction requires expressly defining the location restriction. Applicant's claimed arrangement can be practiced, e.g., using a single bit flag. (Same is particularly claimed in claim 31.)

Again, Roese does not teach the method defined by claim 11.

Claims 19-21 and 24 have been rejected as anticipated by the commonly-owned application of Levy (20010044899). A continuation of that application is still pending, so applicants will consider copying these claims into that application. Claims 23 and 24 – which depend from claim 19 – have likewise been canceled.

Claims 1, 10, 18, 25-26 and 28 are rejected over Roese in view of Levy ('899).

Claim 1 requires making the claimed determination by reference to one or more "single-bit flags." Roese is not understood to operate in this manner. Rather, Roese seems to require a more lengthy description of the geographical limitation.

Accordingly, the art – if combined in the manner proposed – would not yield the claimed arrangement.

(Claim 31 is newly added, and specifies that the determining proceeds with reference to "one single bit flag.")

Claim 25 stands rejected over Roese in view of Levy '899. The Action contends that Roese teaches all of claim 25 except:

> *extracting restriction information from header data conveyed with the* *video entertainment;*
>
> *discerning the restriction information by reference to data decoded from* *digital watermark information hidden within the video entertainment;* and
>
> *including data indicating said ascertained restriction information in* *header portions of each of said IP packets.*

However, Roese also does not disclose a computing device in a consumer's home network that divides video entertainment among payload portions of plural IP packets. Instead, in Roese, the dividing of content into packet form is understood to be done by a remote party. No device at a consumer's home performs this act.

Again, the art – if combined in the manner proposed – would not yield the claimed arrangement.

For brevity's sake, these remarks have only addressed certain of the claims, and have detailed only certain of the distinctions between the claims and the art. However, such discussion is believed sufficient to establish the allowability of all pending claims. Thus, applicant does not further belabor this paper with other arguments concerning the rejections, the art, and the claims – all of which are reserved for possible later presentation.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 19, 2009

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

CUSTOMER NUMBER 23735

By____/William Y. Conwell/_____

Phone: 503-469-4800

William Y. Conwell

FAX 503-469-4777

Registration No. 31,943

10